| Title             | Long Straight Section                              |      |   |                 |  |
|-------------------|--|------|---|-----------------|--|
| Project Requestor | Greg Wiemerslage                                   |      |   |                 |  |
| Date              | 3/21/08  |      |   |                 |  |
| Group Leader(s)   | P. DenHartog                                       |      |   |                 |  |
| Machine or Sector | Efim Gluskin                                       |      |   |                 |  |
| Manager           |  |      |   |                 |  |
| Category          | Accelerator hardware and Insertion Device Upgrades |      |   |                 |  |
| Content ID*       | APS_1254431  | Rev. | 2 | 3/21/08 3:17 PM |  |

<sup>\*</sup>This row is filled in automatically on check in to ICMS. See Note <sup>1</sup>

**Description:** 

| Start Year (FY) | 2009 | <b>Duration (Yr)</b> | 3 |
|-----------------|------|----------------------|---|

### **Objectives:**

Design and prototype a long straight section for the Advanced Photon Source storage ring.

### **Benefit:**

This would allow more than two 2.4 m long undulators or an undulator in excess of five meters in length in a single straight section. It would also enable the possibility of a superconducting undulator combined with a hybrid undulator.

| Risks   | of Pro | iect: | See | Note | 2 |
|---------|--------|-------|-----|------|---|
| I/I2I/2 | OLITO  | jeei. | SCC | NOIC |   |

NA at this phase.

# **Consequences of Not Doing Project:** See Note <sup>3</sup>

If the proposed project is not undertakenthe options for undulators will be limited to the current configuration.

# **Cost/Benefit Analysis:** See Note <sup>4</sup>

The APS has previously investigated options for increasing the active length for undulators. See

http://www.aps4.anl.gov/operations/ops\_www/APSOnly/LongStraightSection/LongStrai

## ghtSection.html

Case 1 which increases the available space for an undulator vacuum to 8.51 m is seen as the most cost effective. Other cases result in significantly higher costs,

### **Description:**

Design and fabricate and assemble the girders upstream and downstream of the undulator that implement the Case 1 design and design and fabricate a long ID vacuum chamber.

# **Funding Details**

**Cost: (\$K)** 

Use FY08 dollars.

| Year  | AIP | Contingency |
|-------|-----|-------------|
| 1     | 100 |             |
| 2     | 200 |             |
| 3     | 100 |             |
| 4     |     |             |
| 5     |     |             |
| 6     |     |             |
| 7     |     |             |
| 8     |     |             |
| 9     |     |             |
| Total | 400 | 20%         |

Contingency may be in dollars or percent. Enter figure for total project contingency.

**Effort: (FTE)** 

The effort portion need not be filled out in detail by March 28

The effort portion need not be filled out in detail by March 28

#### Effort (FTE)

|      | Mechanical | Electrical |           | Software |      |          |          |       |
|------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|------|----------|----------|-------|
| Year | Engineer   | Engineer   | Physicist | Engineer | Tech | Designer | Post Doc | Total |
| 1    | 1          |            |           |          | 0.3  | 1        |          | 2.3   |
| 2    | 0.5        |            |           |          | 1    | 0.5      |          | 2     |
| 3    | 0.25       |            |           |          | 0.5  | 0.1      |          | 0.85  |
| 4    |            |            |           |          |      |          |          | 0     |
| 5    |            |            |           |          |      |          |          | 0     |
| 6    |            |            |           |          |      |          |          | 0     |

#### **Notes:**

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> ICMS. Check in first revision to ICMS as a *New Check In*. Subsequent revisions should be checked in as revisions to that document i.e. Check Out the previous version and Check In the new version. Be sure to complete the *Document Date* field on the check in screen.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Risk Assessment. Advise of the potential impact to the facility or operations that may result as a consequence of performing the proposed activity. Example: If the proposed project is undertaken then other systems impacted by the work include ... (If no assessment is appropriate then enter NA.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Consequence Assessment. Advise of the potential consequences to the facility or to operations if the proposal is not executed. Example: If the proposed project is not undertaken then \_\_\_\_\_ may happen to the facility. (If no assessment is appropriate then enter NA.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Cost Benefit Analysis. Describe cost efficiencies or value of the risk mitigated by the expenditure. Example: Failure to complete this maintenance project will result in increased total costs to the APS for emergency repairs and this investment of \_\_\_ will also result in improved reliability of \_\_\_\_. (If no assessment is appropriate then enter NA.)